



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/463,271	01/24/2000	ANDRE KAUP	P00.0103	6121
29177	7590	07/27/2005	EXAMINER	
BELL, BOYD & LLOYD, LLC			CARTER, AARON W	
P. O. BOX 1135				
CHICAGO, IL 60690-1135			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2625	

DATE MAILED: 07/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/463,271	KAUP, ANDRE	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Aaron W. Carter	2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 April 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 11-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 11-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 24 January 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to papers filed on April 25, 2005.

Response to Amendment

2. In response to applicant's amendment received on April 25, 2005, all requested changes to the specification and claims have been entered.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed April 25, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue that none of the prior art teach or fairly suggests "providing that said image sequence include predetermined individual objects that are respectively coded according to one of an MPEG standard and an ITU standard, said individual objects being at least one of audio objects and video objects". The basis of the argument being that Applicants continue to argue that the "open spaces" of Mehrotra do not equate to the "individual objects" disclosed in the claims, however the argument is moot, no where in the previous rejection, mailed on January 24, 2005, are "open spaces" equated to "individual objects". The rejection clearly stated "each image sequence contains **individual objects** in the form of **individual images**". Each individual image corresponds to an individual object, the examiner is not saying that the open space of each image corresponds to the individual objects claimed by the applicant.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 11-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,115,717 to Mehrotra et al. ("Mehrotra") (already of record) in view of USPN 5,987,459 to Swanson et al. ("Swanson") (already of record).

As to claim 11, Mehrotra discloses a method for storing search features (column 2, lines 3-4, wherein metadata corresponds to search features) of an image sequence (column 3, lines 57-64), said method comprising the steps of:

Providing that said image sequence include predetermined individual objects, said individual objects being at least one of audio objects and video objects (column 3, lines 57-65, wherein each image sequence contains individual objects in the form of predetermined individual images, wherein individual images corresponds to video objects);

determining said search features from said image sequence (column 3, lines 20-24 and column 3, line 65 – column 4, line 2, wherein open space metadata corresponds to a search feature and for each image all the open space metadata is computed for all the open spaces present in each image corresponding to features); and

storing said features together with said image sequence wherein separate search feature sets are provided for each individual object (column 3, lines 24-26 and lines 57-60, wherein each

Art Unit: 2625

image has its own separate search feature set in the form of open space metadata and is stored along each image in the image sequence).

Mehrotra does not disclose expressly that the individual object, in this case each image, is coded according to one of an MPEG standard and an ITU standard.

Swanson discloses storing search features that there are disadvantages of attaching search features to a compressed image file (18) either as a prefix (20) or appended (20) to the file (Figure 1 and column 3, lines 19-27). He goes on to discuss several advantages of storing the search features directly into the image (26, Figure 1 and column 3, lines 28-39) in the image is preferably coded using the JPEG algorithm (column 10, lines 24-25, wherein JPEG corresponds to an ITU standard).

Mehrotra & Swanson are combinable because they are from the same art of image processing and specifically image storage and retrieval.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to code the image disclosed by Mehrotra using an ITU standard, in this case the JPEG standard.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide the advantage of keeping search features in close proximity of the image sequence for increased retrieval time and by storing search features in the image sequence storage space required could be reduced (Swanson, column 1, lines 40-47).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Mehrotra with Swanson to obtain the invention as specified in claim 11.

As to claim 12, the combination of Mehrotra and Swanson discloses the method as claimed in claim 11, wherein said search features are at least one of audio data and video data of said of said image (Mehrotra, column 5, lines 9-12 and Fig. 5 wherein metadata contains video data of the image).

As to claim 13, the combination of Mehrotra and Swanson discloses the method as claimed in claim 11, wherein said search features comprise a reference to an image within said image sequence for assisting in accessing said image within said image sequence (Mehrotra, Fig. 5, wherein each image is provided an image-ID or inherently a frame number).

As to claim 19, the combination of Mehrotra and Swanson discloses the method as claimed in claim 11, wherein separate search features for several objects that are contained in said image sequence according to image coding standards are respectively stored together with said image sequence (Mehrotra, column 6, lines 60-62).

As to claim 20, the combination of Mehrotra and Swanson discloses the method as claimed in claim 11, wherein said search features can be unambiguously identified by a predeterminable start code (Mehrotra, column 12, lines 20-22 and Fig. 9).

As to claims 14-16, please refer to the rejection made for claim 11 above.

As to claim 17, Mehrotra and Swanson combined provide us with the method of claim 16, comprising of storing search features in an image sequence. Swanson discuss the addition of

Art Unit: 2625

the search features as a prefix (“file header”, column 3; lines 56-62) to a file created preferably according to the JPEG compression standard (column 4, lines 24-25), but neglects to explicitly mention the search features can be stored as a prefix to an intra-image created according to the MPEG standard. The Examiner takes Official Notice that the intra-image according to MPEG standard is well known in the art as a still image contained in the MPEG file, as well as the JPEG standard being a well known coding technique in the field of individual images. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to create a MPEG file of the audiovisual sequence discussed by Mehrotra and to store search feature as prefix to an intra-image using technique disclosed by Swanson. This would provide the advantage of reduced storage space.

As to claim 18, the combination of Mehrotra and Swanson discloses a method according to claim 17, wherein each image scene of said image sequence is stored in a database (Mehrotra, Fig. 1, element 18 and column 6, lines 60-62).

Conclusion

6. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aaron W. Carter whose telephone number is (571) 272-7445. The examiner can normally be reached on 8am - 4:30 am (Mon. - Fri.).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bhavesh Mehta can be reached on (571) 272-7453. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

awc
AWC



BHAVESH M. MEHTA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600